

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

CHRISTOPHER J. ANDRESKI,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	No. 1:24-cv-699
-v-	)	
	)	Honorable Paul L. Maloney
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,	)	
<i>et al.</i> ,	)	
Defendants.	)	
<hr/>		

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Plaintiff Christopher Andreski, proceeding without the assistance of counsel, initiated the lawsuit in July 2024. The Court approved his request for in forma pauperis status.

On November 8, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued a report recommending the Court dismiss this lawsuit for two reasons: (1) failure to state a claim and (2) failure to follow court orders (ECF No. 28). Plaintiff filed objections (ECF No. 29). The Court will adopt the report and recommendation and will dismiss this lawsuit.

A.

After being served with a report and recommendation (R&R) issued by a magistrate judge, a party has fourteen days to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). A district court judge reviews de novo the portions of the R&R to which objections have been filed. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Only those objections that are specific are entitled to a de novo review under the statute. *Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986) (per curiam).

B.

The Magistrate Judge summarizes how this lawsuit has progressed. Soon after Plaintiff filed the documents used to open this action, the Magistrate Judge issued a report recommending that Plaintiff be ordered to file a complaint that complies with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Magistrate Judge addressed the documents Plaintiff had filed and identified the deficiencies in those documents. The Magistrate Judge then suggested several on-line sources that Plaintiff might want to consult. The Court adopted the R&R, which included a warning that the failure to file an appropriate amended complaint might lead to the dismissal of this lawsuit (ECF No. 21).

Plaintiff filed six documents (not including exhibits) after the Court adopted the R&R and ordered Plaintiff to file an amended complaint (ECF Nos. 22-27). Collectively the documents contain more than 1400 pages. None of the documents contain an amended complaint that complies with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

The Magistrate Judge then issued a second report, this time recommending the Court dismiss the lawsuit (ECF No. 28). The Magistrate Judge again summarized the progress of this lawsuit. The Magistrate Judge again explained the lack of factual allegations sufficient to state a legal claim. The Magistrate Judge briefly addressed each of the six documents Plaintiff had filed.

Plaintiff filed an objection consisting of a 34-page document which contains 78 paragraphs identifying the relief he seeks. The objection also includes another 70 pages of exhibits.

The Court overrules Plaintiff's objections. The Court declines to disqualify the Magistrate Judge because Plaintiff has not established a sufficient factual or legal basis for this Court to do so. Plaintiff has not identified any factual or legal error in the second report and recommendation. The Court has reviewed the six documents filed after the Court ordered Plaintiff to file an amended complaint. The Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge that Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint that complies with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Court has attempted to interpret the documents liberally, as Plaintiff is not an attorney. The documents do not set forth sufficient factual allegations against any particular defendant for the Court to find that Plaintiff has pled a claim upon which relief may be granted.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 28). The Court **DISMISSES** this lawsuit for failing to comply with the Court's order and for failing to plead facts sufficient to state a claim for relief. The Court finds that any appeal would be frivolous and would not be taken in good faith. The Court also **DENIES** a certificate of appealability because reasonable jurists would not disagree with the manner in which the Court has resolved this lawsuit. **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Date: December 4, 2024

/s/ Paul L. Maloney  
Paul L. Maloney  
United States District Judge